

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-37 and 41-43 were pending in the Application. By this Amendment, claims 1-10, 27-40 and 43 are being cancelled to advance the prosecution of the Application. No new matter is involved.

The Office Action rejects all of claims 1-37 and 41-43 as unpatentable over various combinations of the references. The references include Furuya, newly cited U.S. Patent 6,056,195 of Spain, Zinsmeyer, Mochinaga, and Bahrabadi. These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to claims 11-26, 41 and 42 which are the claims remaining in the Application. Claims 1-10, 27-40 and 43 are being cancelled.

In rejecting the claims which remain in the Application, the Office Action relies primarily on the combination of Furuya and Spain. The rejection of claims 11-13 is based on such combination. Claims 14-19 and 21-26 are rejected on the combination of Furuya, Spain and Zinsmeyer, while the rejection of claim 20 is rejected on such combination combined with Bahrabadi. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected on the combination of Zinsmeyer, Spain and Mochinaga.

With respect to the basic combination of Furuya and Spain, Furuya was discussed in Applicant's prior Amendment of November 9, 2005. As noted on page 11 of that paper, the Examiner agrees with Applicant in that the desired configuration information, which is set by a user, and the type of information contained in the desired configuration information, is different than what Furuya teaches. However, the Examiner maintains that this difference was not apparent in the wording of the claims. The explanation of the "desired configuration information" was said not to be sufficient to clearly determine what kind of information is being claimed. Consequently, the Amendment of November 9, 2005 addressed specific arguments of the Examiner.

The reference to Spain is newly cited. As stated in the middle of page 3 of the Office Action, Spain discloses inputting desired configuration information which is other than information related to physical properties (see Figs. 2B and 3, and column 4, lines 13-17, 23-26, and 64-66, reference shows that information input by a user is encoded in a barcode, which is part of a bar code label, such information can be text information that is in a desired typeface).

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Spain reference. As a result of such review, it is noted that Spain discloses the following features:

1. "the ability to print bar code label having text in a language font selected from a plurality of language fonts" (col. 4, lines 13-15).
2. "presented in a bar code standard selected by the user and that encodes data input by the user" (col. 4, lines 25-26).
3. "The user selects a bar code standard 102 and enters data 104 to be encoded as a bar code" (col. 4, lines 64-66).

In other words, according to Spain, the bar code can be produced (not based on the information related to the physical properties of a tape cartridge but) based on the fonts desired and selected by the user.

If there is any art which is similar to the present invention, it is that the label can be produced by the user by his or her own input of the information (other than the physical properties) that can be selected by himself. Such art, however, reaches only to the point of producing the label. It neither discloses nor suggests the important portion of the present invention which is printing an image on the tape based on the produced bar code (to be detected image), as noted below.

The principal features of the present invention include the following:

1. "a tape printed with a to-be-detected image representative of desired configuration information".

2. "detection label labeled on the tape cartridge".
3. "printing an image based on the desired configuration information represented by the to-be-detected image".

In other words, as described at lines 6-19 and particularly lines 13-16 of page 9 and elsewhere, simply by mounting the tape cartridge, the print image can be printed on the tape based on the to-be-detected image printed on the detection label without newly setting the desired configuration information.

Regarding the combination of Furuya and Spain, the technical details regarding the bar code as disclosed by Spain are limited to the art of producing a bar code by utilizing the various fonts and the like that the user can input, as noted above.

On the other hand, Furuya represents one of the features thereof in [0050] to the effect that "a cost cut can be aimed at by communalization of a tape-cartridge body." In other words, by means of the label attached to the tape cartridge itself, it will be able to show the information about the specification of the tape cartridge. However, there is neither disclosure nor suggestion about the art which enables "to print the predetermined fixed-form character string image simply by mounting the tape cartridge without newly inputting the character string" (see page 2, last line, to line 2 of page 3).

In other words, simply combining the bar code of Spain with the seal of Furuya will not reach the present invention in that the "print image is printed on the tape based on the to-be-detected image printed on the detection label". Moreover, there is no motivation to combine the two references.

Therefore, the claims clearly distinguish patentably over the basic combination of Furuya and Spain. The addition of Zinsmeyer, Bahrabadi and

Mochinaga in rejecting some of the claims does not remedy the basic shortcomings of the combination of Furuya and Spain.

Claim 11 sets forth all of the features in accordance with the present invention which are noted above. These include "a first tape printed with a to-be-detected image representative of desired configuration information", "detection label labeled on said tape cartridge", and "printing an image . . . based on said desired configuration information represented by said to-be-detected image". Therefore, claim 11 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art. Similar comments apply to claims 12 and 13 which depend from and contain all of the limitations of claim 11.

Similarly, independent claim 14 which is a method claim includes all of the features of the present invention noted above. This claim includes "printing a to-be-detected image representative of said desired configuration", "detection label labeled on said second tape cartridge", and "printing a print image . . . based on said desired configuration information represented by said to-be-detected image". Therefore, claim 14 is submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art.

Similar comments apply to claims 15-26 which depend directly or indirectly from and contain all of the limitations of claim 14.

Independent claim 41 sets forth the feature in accordance with the present invention of "printing a fixed-form character string image based on character string information represented by to-be-detected image". Therefore, claim 41, and claim 42 which depends therefrom, are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art.

In conclusion, claims 11-26, 41 and 42 are submitted to clearly distinguish patentably over the prior art for the reasons discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 09/826,408
Amdt. Dated March 23, 2006
Reply to Office Action of January 30, 2006

Attorney Docket No. 81752.0105
Customer No.: 26021

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6846 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,
HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

Date: March 23, 2006

By: 

John P. Scherlacher
Registration No. 23,009
Attorney for Applicant(s)

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701